DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 023 805 VT 004 232

By-Herman, Melvin; Sadofsky, Stanley

Workshop on Problems of Planning, Recruitment and Selection for Youth-Work Programs, Summary of Proceedings (Sterling Forest, N.Y., November 30-December 2, 1965).

New York Univ., N.Y. Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth.

Pub Date 65

Note-43p.

Available from-Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth, Grad. School of Soc. Work, New York Univ., 853 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10003 ($.50).

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC Not Available from EDRS.

Descriptors-Administrative Problems, Disadvantaged Youth, Participant Characteristics, *Personnel Selection, Prevocational Education, *Program Planning, *Recruitment, Unemployed, Vocational Education, Work Experience Programs, Workshops, Youth Agencies, *Youth Employment, *Youth Programs

Thirty-five representatives of local, state, and federal youth-work programs attended a workshop which focused on issues related to planning a youth-work program, identifying the target population, designing a comprehensive program, and recruiting, screening, and selecting youth. Its agenda was established following field visits to a dozen youth-work programs of community action agencies in New Jersey, New York, Connecticut, and Massachusetts. There was considerable discussion of the comparatively meagre resources allocated to the communities for planning work program activities. There was general agreement as to the urgency for much fuller information about the target population. It was maintained that disadvantaged youth require a range of services that includes work evaluation, prevocational work experience, vocational skill training, job placement, and supportive services, which should become the components of a comprehensive program. The one problem of recruitment which concerned every program was the achievement of a balanced group recruited, selected, and enrolled. The overriding problem was expressed as the danger of the recruitment effort's producing a group all of one ethnic background. The issues raised by newly promulgated family income criteria for enrollment of youth, problems of validating income, and provisions for youth program rejectees were discussed. (PS)

C.1

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS: WORKSHOP ON PROBLEMS OF PLANNING, RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION FOR YOUTH-WORK PROGRAMS

ED023805

TRAINING SERIES

VT004232

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF UNEMPLOYED YOUTH
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK • NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

The Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth is conducting training, consultation, curriculum development and research relating to the employment problems of disadvantaged youth.

•

Dean, Graduate School of Social Work
Alex Rosen

•

Co-Directors, Center For The Study of Unemployed Youth
Melvin Herman
Stanley Sadofsky

•

3 Washington Square North
New York, New York 10003

•

853 Broadway
New York, New York 10003

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS:

WORKSHOP ON

Problems of Planning, Recruitment and Selection For Youth-Work Programs

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Nov. 30 - Dec. 2, 1965

Sterling Forest, N. Y.

Center For The Study of
Unemployed Youth
Graduate School of Social Work
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

NAME	ORGANIZATION AND CITY
Mr. Albert I. Ascher	Career Oriented Preparation for Employment (COPE) Newark, New Jersey
Mr. Stephen Berman	Community Renewal Team of Greater Hartford Hartford, Connecticut
Mr. Milton Boyarsky	Neighborhood Youth Corps Schenectady, New York
Mrs. Linda Broderick	Chelsea Community Action Program Chelsea, Massachusetts
Miss Virginia Burns	President's Committee Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, U. S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare Washington, D. C.
Mr. Daniel E. Clifford	Cambridge Economic Opportunity Committee, Inc. Cambridge, Massachusetts
Mrs. Ethelind Collins	Connecticut State Employment Connecticut Labor Department Hartford, Connecticut
Mr. Raymond T. Copeland	White Plains Neighborhood Youth Corps
Mrs. Mary M. Dewey	Connecticut State Employment Connecticut Labor Department Hartford, Connecticut
Mrs. Beatrice Hill	Neighborhood Youth Corps Washington, D. C.
Mr. Herbert A. Howe	New York State Employment Dept. of Labor, Division of Employment
Mrs. Elsa W. Koestler	Community Welfare Council of Eastern Union County Elizabeth, New Jersey

NAME	ORGANIZATION AND CITY
Mr. Robert Meyer	Community Action Program New Rochelle, New York
Mr. Thomas Miller	Youth Opportunity Center Newark, New Jersey
Mr. Martin Moed	Mobilization for Youth, Inc. New York City, New York
Miss Sheila Morganstern	President's Committee Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, U. S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare Washington, D. C.
Mr. James C. Nolan	Lynn Economic Opportunity, Inc. Lynn, Massachusetts
Mrs. Regina Saxton	Neighborhood Youth Corps Washington, D. C.
Mr. Zinnerford Smith	Community & Neighborhood Development Organization Jersey City, New Jersey
Mr. William Wolfe	Urban League of Westchester, Inc.
STAFF	
Dr. Melvin Herman	New York University Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth
Mr. Stanley Sadofsky	New York University Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth
Dr. R. A. Nixon	New York University Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth
Dr. Joseph C. Lagey	New York University Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS:

WORKSHOP ON

Problems of Planning, Recruitment

and

Selection For Youth-Work Programs

INTRODUCTION:

The Workshop was conducted by the Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth of the Graduate School of Social Work, New York University under the auspices of the **Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.**

The Center engages in a variety of activities designed to contribute to our knowledge of the multiple problems faced by unemployed youth and to assist in the planning and administration of programs for such youth. These activities include **research, institutes and workshops, curriculum development for staff training and consultation.** The Center has just published a report of a **year-long survey of youth-work programs in nine cities across** the nation. It is currently engaged in a **three year study of changes in work attitudes and performance of youth enrolled in the Neighborhood Youth Corps in New York City.**

In the course of conducting these and other related activities, the staff of the Center became aware of the serious need for the development of materials which could be used in staff training to fulfill this need. The Center is engaged in the development of such materials, primarily through a series of workshops and institutes attended by small groups of youth-work program specialists.

The workshop discussion summarized in these proceedings is the first of a series. Its agenda was established following field visits by our staff to a dozen youth-work programs of community action agencies in **New Jersey, New York, Connecticut** and **Massachusetts.** These visits served to identify a wide range of issues and problems faced by local staff, which was too broad to encompass in any one workshop. To focus the discussions, a cluster of issues was selected which typically emerge in planning and de-

signing of a comprehensive youth-work program. More specifically, the workshop was organized around the following major topics:

The Planning Process

Identifying the Target Population

A Comprehensive Youth-Work Program

Recruitment of Youth

Screening and Selection

It is expected that the varied issues related to the actual operation of such programs will be covered in subsequent workshops and institutes.

This workshop, held November 30 through December 2, 1965 at Sterling Forest, New York, was attended by 35 representatives of local, state and federal programs. A detailed discussion guide was distributed to all participants prior to the workshop. A stenographic transcript was made of all the sessions and provided the basis for this report. The workshop discussions have been summarized and prepared for distribution as quickly as possible in order to preserve their timeliness for a maximum number of potential users.

PLANNING A YOUTH-WORK PROGRAM

As an introduction to the workshop discussion, planning was held to consist of a series of related activities which precede the opening of a work program. Such issues were considered germane to the planning of youth work programs as its purpose; conceptions of planning as a process; its major requirements, problems and decisions; its relationship to local Community Action Programs and other community agencies; the organization of planning staffs; and the restraints which have been experienced to date in planning youth-work programs.

The Objectives of Planning

Workshop participants recognize the existence of certain basic issues which needed to be resolved in the early stages of the planning process. For example, should a youth-work program primarily coordinate existing community agencies and services or should it actually operate the program? **Are the problems of disadvantaged youth the result of deficiencies in the individual or failures in social institutions?** Should a community initiate its work program for youth as a separate or as an integral aspect of its total

unemployment or poverty problem? The answers to these questions, it was recognized, would significantly influence decisions regarding planning objectives, planning activities, the personnel selected to do the planning, and the ultimate character of the program to be implemented. As one participant observed —

> "In the local community, the nature of the work program — the kind of subcontracts it enters into, the role of Goodwill Industries and other kinds of rehabilitative facilities, whether work is viewed as therapeutic, and so on — all these things reflect the kinds of decisions made during the planning process. . . . Again, if you start with the assumption that the purpose of planning on the part of the CAP work component is to get the maximum mileage out of existing agencies then you do one set of things. For example, you try to involve the school, the employment service, rehabilitation agencies and other community groups in your planning process. If, on the other hand, you start with the assumption that the community really needs a 'shot-in-the arm' in the form of a new operating structure, then planning takes a different shape."

Participants were unanimous in their belief that a central organization (the CAP) was essential in order to coordinate the various aspects of the work program as well as to integrate work programs with other CAP programs. They tended to reject the notion that CAPS should become service programs. One of the "primary" problems perceived by one participant was, **"that our Community Action Programs are becoming, in some areas, another social agency; they are not community action programs".**

As a "marriage broker in the community" the CAP was believed responsible for planning the elimination of duplication of services and interagency competition. Centralized planning was also considered necessary to meet the total needs of the community through use of all its resources, and, conversely, to avoid excessive concentration upon any section of the community or specialized agencies or services. In one city, it was noted that more than four major agencies were independently planning and requesting funds for Neighborhood Youth Corps projects.

Most participants agreed that effective planning of coordinated community services depends upon **"the establishment of a power base (largely political), since we are living in a competitive world".** Another participant suggested that federal agencies should make greater efforts to determine whether truly coordinated planning has occurred before funding local programs. Their failure to do so weakens the accepted concept of co-

ordinated planning, and leads to confusion when work programs are funde in a community without the knowledge of the local CAP.

Workshop participants stressed the necessity for **joint** planning with the employment service and the public schools. In regard to the schools, however, participants were critical of the excessive preoccupation of school counselors with youngsters going into higher education and their neglect of those going into the labor market. In some cities, participants noted, school systems had no vocational guidance or counseling program for youngsters who were not college-bound.

In spite of the difficulties involved in coordinating the school's resources with the youth work progra , some significant success along these lines was reported. In two cities arrangements had been worked out with the public schools to provide Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees assigned to special programs with credits towards a training certificate. In another community the work program has set up a series of workshops for school counselors and the employment service to establish procedures relating to "the inter-agency referal card, follow-up information on drop-outs or potential drop-outs, and any type of liaison between the two organizations which would be useful to the individual (youth) involved".

Another important theme of the workshop discussions was the necessity to base coordinated planning activities upon a clear understanding of the nature of the social problem. While the problem of youthful unemployment can be described in many ways, one participant suggested that, **"One extreme is the perspective which sees the problem as residing in the inadequacies of the individual adolescent.** I think, traditionally, we have planned our work programs around this perspective and have failed considerably. As a result, **I would move closer to the other perspective which sees the problems of youth as related to the deficiencies in the social system — in social institutions".**

Unfortunately, time did not permit a full examination of this issue. It was clear, nevertheless, as one participant pointed out, that, "We are working with individuals, and we have to do it moment by moment". But whether youth-work programs should be viewed as vehicles for achieving institutional change was not explored.

Identification of the objectives of the youth-work program was suggested as another significant decision that had to be made during planning. One participant defined the issue in these terms: "One of the things you have to consider [in planning youth-work programs] is what you want from

these programs. I can remember when our problem was to provide jobs for people to stay out of trouble — a rather limited objective, but which met the need of the times. Now, it seems to me, the focus of youth-work programs is to provide some form of stable employment. This implies less concern with getting somebody a job or reporting placement statistics and more emphasis upon insuring that a youth will have the wherewithal to keep a job a year or two later or during a recession period". Emphasis was generally placed upon the latter objective, the achievement of which, it was recognized, would require a comprehensive program of counseling, remedial education and a variety of work training components such as the N.Y.C., O.J.T.and MDTA institutional training. Still, some participants pointed out that the work programs must also be prepared to serve youth whose immediate need is for employment now. Another participant warned against, "thinking that we can plan the lives and careers of these youngsters, step by step. I think we have to develop a broad, general picture and be sure that they are able to move in various directions".

Should a community initiate its youth work program as part of a total unemployment or poverty program, or as a separate entity? Participants adopted somewhat different approaches to this question. As a practical matter, many believed it was necessary to start with youth, first, because, "This is the way you create impact or high visibility of your program in the community". In addition, funds are more readily available for youth than adult work programs. On the other hand, some participants believed that, "In a very real sense, these kids are competing with their fathers and mothers for the same kind of employment-training experience. Perhaps we should be working with them first, at least affording them a similar opportunity". For others, and perhaps for all, the question underscored the necessity for developing a master plan, or a building-block approach which would embrace all occupationally needy individuals from the in-school youth to the older worker.

Although participants felt they knew generally how to proceed with the development of a master plan, they were concerned about their inability to obtain the funds required to survey the needs of their communities. Some participants suggested that it would be well for federal agencies to evaluate a community's work program in relation to its master plan. Others were concerned about the youth who seemed to fall into the interstices of presently available program components or building blocks. Specifically mentioned were the "multitudes of young people who are ineligible for the Neighborhood Youth Corps because they aren't poor enough". In one community, at least, the work program has attempted through the local

Chamber of Commerce and other private resources to establish an "unofficial" or "parallel Neighborhood Youth Corps for ineligible youth".

The Planners

Workshop participants raised a series of questions concerning the individuals or groups within a community who initiate the planning of a CAP or youth work program; those who actually do the planning; and those who control the planning process. The status, interests and backgrounds of those intimately involved in planning, it was held, vitally effects the character of the process and its product.

Discussion of these questions was initiated by one participant in the following terms: "One of the questions that is asked of me all the time is, if because of my position and my job I had not taken the initative to move the community, who would have done it? And the answer, as far as we can see, is, 'Nobody'. Its that kind of problem that's bothering me. How many communities are bogged down because there isn't any starting point? What is the starting point"?

In addition to the answer suggested by the individual who raised the question, others mentioned included — "Anybody [in the community] who was interested" could initiate the program. In many communities, federal agencies attempted to stimulate interest in their own programs, while in others, the work program and the poverty program grew out of existing local programs concerned with such related social problems as the reduction of juvenile delinquency or school segregation. Furthermore, participants alluded to the variety of motivations that stimuated the initiation of such programs. In some instances there was the perception of real community needs, but in others the motivating force was largely political or the need, at least, to be fashionable. The variety of individuals, agencies and starting points for the planning of CAP and youth-work programs made it difficult to identify the specific influences of these factors upon the planning process and its output, but none doubted that such influences exist and are significant.

Discussion of the impact of the background of the planners upon the plan was limited. However, participants agreed that planning decisions and the ultimate character of the youth-work program reflect the professional experiences and predilections of the planners. For some, this conclusion raised the possibility of bias in the accumulation and utilization of planning data as well as in the identification of community needs. On the other hand, in the opinion of one participant, the question of "who controls the planning is even more important than who does the planning".

Planning Resources

There was considerable discussion of the comparatively meagre resources allocated to the communities for planning CAP and work program activities. One participant rather bitterly pointed out that, "I was appointed Director July 9. Nobody was in the city: all were on vacation. I had no money, no staff, no secretary — no anything. . . . .[and] August 15 was the deadline for our out-of-school [NYC] program. It was absurd to think I might design anything which would make sense in that length of time". Similar complaints were made by other participants. Some referred to the absence in their communities of specialized service agencies around which to develop a meaningful plan; others spoke of the need for knowledgeable personnel to develop and write proposals acceptable to federal agencies; and, a few complained that the regional representatives of federal agencies were not fulfilling their responsibilities adequately.

A number of participants stressed inadequate communication as a handicap in planning their youth-work programs. Deficiencies in communication appear to take two forms. First, as one participant noted, there is the failure to provide information about what is going on in youth-work programs in other cities — "how much they expected to accomplish, where they were not accomplishing it and where the gaps are". Second, communities which do not as yet have a NYC project , but which may be planning one, have no channel of communication with the Labor Department — specifically for receiving new directives, regulations and other information. As noted earlier, participants also reported the failure of federal agencies to coordinate with or inform the local CAP when they funded youth-work projects in their community. In one city, for example, the CAP in cooperation with many local agencies had spent months in planning the development of a skill center under the MDTA. Then out of the clear blue-sky, $1.9 million was allocated through Vocational Education to MDTA to open up a skill center with no discussion and no prior arrangements with CAP agencies".

The participant last quoted concluded that meaningful planning at local levels requires the support of coordinated planning among federal agencies. This statement found strong support in the views of other workshop participants. It was observed that within the poverty program some federal agencies were old and established, while others were brand new. Each agency has its own background, objectives, regulations, procedures and criteria which confuse the local planning process. "This situation", observed one participant, "gets reflected when you can't seem to get the kinds of answers you need in order to get your program started, or when your program is cut without a great deal of understanding. But, more than that, it gets reflected in who calls the shots".

The profusion of federal agencies, each with its own ground rules, was held accountable in some measure for a funding situation which tends to discourage careful, comprehensive planning. In the opinion of workshop participants delays in funding are often excessive. When finally approved, proposed programs have been drastically reduced without regard to the community's need. Participants from communities that did not submit proposals for a Neighborhood Youth Corps program early in the game were particularly exercised about their failure to obtain funding or about the reductions in their proposed programs. Representatives of smaller communities felt they were not as likely as their larger urban neighbors to obtain funds for their programs. One participant explained that, "In the second year a great many communities have applied for NYC funds. But, [the Labor Department] didn't allocate or obtain the proper amount of funds, they didn't anticipate this much participation. Thus, if you are a going concern, you get funded, almost indiscriminately. If you're not, it doesn't seem to me to matter what your program is, you will have difficulty getting it funded". In response, it was pointed out that the Labor Department is aware that funding on a 'first come, first served' basis not only encourages shallow planning, but contains other inequities as well. The Department, it was maintained, is giving thought to what it calls 'program priority' — that is, it is trying to look at the country as a whole and determine in which areas it needs to fund certain kinds of projects".

Conceptions of the Current Work Program Planning Process

All participants agreed that the planning of a local youth work program should be comprehensive and rooted in a realistic understanding of the community's needs. However, there were some who felt that in reality planning involves, "filling out forms, providing the required statistics so that these programs can be justified to Congress". This view rests upon (1) the perceived requirement for meeting proposal deadlines, for "hurrying it up, getting the planning over with;" and (2) the limitation upon permissible overhead in the NYC program, which drastically curtails necessary supportive services.

While recognizing that the overhead rates established by the NYC may be related to the limited funds with which it is supposed to operate, it was suggested that, "We may be doing too much for too little money in the interest of proliferation, of spreading programs around the country. Maybe somebody has to say that". In rejoinder, it was noted that other than NYC sources exist through which needed work program services could be obtained. The Elementary and Secondary School Education Act of 1965,

which provides for counseling, testing and health services, was cited as an illustration. Further, it was maintained that the acquisition of supportive services from such other sources had always been an integral part of the national NYC program. But, one participant argued, "We have known for a long time that there are all these other kinds of programs and moneys backing up the NYC, but I have yet to see any spelling-out at all of the rules and regulations of the particular agencies that control other funds or the possible ways we can apply for them. I'd like to see these written down so each of us doesn't have to struggle through the process of digging the material out". In New Jersey, it was suggested, the Department of Labor has accomplished this task through administrative instructions and circular letters.

In the opinion of most participants the capacity to plan a youth-work program is developed only with time and experience. For example, it was suggested that, "Now that we have had a year's experience with the NYC program, we are beginning to do some planning. And, how are we doing it? Well, we have just formed an employment task force within our CAP agency, not only for youth but to cover the multitude of employment problems — unemployment, underemployment, employment for the physically and mentally handicapped, part-time employment for the elderly, all of these kinds of things. We don't have planning yet, but we are beginning to get some idea of how we might go about it, at least in our city". Regardless of past and present difficulties most participants were convinced not only that they had made an adequate beginning, but that experience would lead to significant improvements in their planning capability and, ultimately, in their youth-work programs.

TARGET POPULATION

This Workshop session dealt with problems of identification and description of the disadvantaged jobless youth — the target population for a comprehensive youth-work program in each community. For some, their earlier use of 1960 census data to meet the requirements of federal program proposal forms seemed to have solved the "Target Population" problem. But the quick development of interest in the discussion and the evaluation report that most participants felt that more time should have been spent on "Target Population" indicated that "there is much more imbedded in this topic than perhaps we have been willing or able to really dig into..."

The Center's Workshop outline and introduction to the Target Population session guided the discussion into four areas: (1) What have been the experiences and problems in identifying the Target Population? (2) Why

bother? Is Target Population identification really important? If so, what for? (3) What kind of information is needed? and (4) How can the necessary Target Population information be procured?

The Experiences and the Problems

The first overwhelming fact is that almost without exception planners and operators of youth-work programs have sparce information about the size of the disadvantaged youth population, and even less about its relevant characteristics. In no instance was there a clear and sure answer to the question, "How many out of work and out of school youths are there in your community"? The best that even the most experienced community could report was "an educated guess" in response. Only general impressions were available about more refined factors such as sex, age, welfare and juvenile delinquency status, or language, health, and family disabilities.

Apparently the youth work programs are somewhat in a transitional stage from the first phase of quick one-shot Neighborhood Youth Corps to a second phase of longer range, more deliberately planned and more comprehensive conceived programs to deal with the complex problems of unemployed, poor, and disadvantaged young people under the age of 22. This process of transition is highly relevant to the approach made to target population research.

The first stage of youth-work development has been dominated by the establishment of NYC projects as largely and sometimes completely independent components in the general Community Action Program. Use of the 1960 Census tracts sufficed to indicate the general size and geographical location of the population in poverty. This satisfied the needs of the proposal forms for funding, and application of a crude income family test was all that seemed essential to initial recruitment and NYC job assignment. Even these basic facts about poverty served to bring about the "discovery" of the facts of life in many communities. There was a tendency to move on from this initial brush with "Target Population" identification to the demanding tasks of project operation. Those workshop participants still primarily operating and thinking on this first stage level were not much exercised about difficulties of Target Population identification. Moreover, it has been possible to proceed to submit proposals for NYC project renewal by repetition of the original proposal census data.

To the extent that the youth-work planners and operators have begun to think and work on the level of comprehensive program planning, the Target Population research problems gain emphasis. A few projects had

initially thought in these terms and had made efforts to fund such research at the very outset. There was complaint that such early proposals for target population research were turned down — "a lot of preliminary work on target population identification had been done on the local level to get the thing off the ground by way of planning, but when we came right up to the point that this seemed to be the first thing to be done — Washington would not fund this research program". It was observed that Congress is unsympathetic to spending money for "dusty studies" and there was a general feeling that "Washington" was remiss in giving support to Target Population research.

In several communities special research efforts had been aimed at Target Population identification. In both their accomplishments and shortcomings they are suggestive samples:

CITY A — Identified over 2,000 unemployed, out of school youths "by adding up the figures from here, there and the other place, hoping there is not too much duplication . . ."

CITY B — A special subcommittee went to work on the census data, supplemented by a team of school guidance counselors who went over school records for the past four years, and by target group data from the Employment Service, city probation office, private and public welfare agencies. This effort combined target data research with recruitment.

CITY C — A two year pilot program was funded by the federal government to compile information concerning the labor market with age, sex, and education classifications.

CITY D — Local groups such as the Human Rights Commission, Human Rights Department of the City Government, the local Youth Corps, and other agencies associated in a community development effort made preliminary surveys of the unemploeyd adult and youth population. Some university assistance was utilized and the federal government gave some special aid.

CITY E — Local universities joined to develop "a proposal which would study, block by block, poverty in the city. We wanted information to update the 1960 census, to make our programs more relevant because we know that some of this 1960 census information isn't useful. This was all put into a semi-proposal and sent off for informal opinion. It

was turned down by OEO. Why? Because they didn't figure this was 'operational research'. The assumption at OEO is that we know enough now to begin programming — you don't need further research, get on with the show . . ."

CITY F — A good estimate of unemployed adults is possible by projection of Employment Service registrations, unemployment compensation files, etc., but not so for youth. A projection in City F, a city of 200,000 indicated that there would be "two or three thousand plus" jobless youth. There were only 350 youths registered at the Employment Service, thus "there were 1,700 we never saw and didn't know about, but we did guess about . . ."

The lack of adequate Target Population data and the difficulties in overcoming this lack was emphasized by a workshop participant who described the experience of an important Employment Service unit with three qualified statisticians "concerned with utilization of census tracts, updating, predicting, using the laws of probability applied to census data and BES internal operating figures". This office attempted to supply youth target population data, but "we couldn't find it . . . we gave them our best advice, which was hardly any advice at all . . . we were pretty much in the same boat of trying to find out about this so-called target group and casting about for some information somewhere . . . we knew nothing about the people who didn't come into the employment office, and still don't . . ."

Why bother? Is Target Population really so important? What for?

Perhaps it was this general inadequacy of existing Target Population data plus the real difficulties in gathering such information which led to several tentative suggestions that this lack was not really of much import. One participant asked whether rough data and general intelligent impressions about the target group wasn't really enough? Another suggested "the actual numbers aren't the thing we need to be concerned with. We have to be concerned with the various types of target population we are going to need to service". A government representative wondered "how much basic difference will you find among the disadvantaged kids". One observation was that "you don't have enough money to care for all the kids anyway, so you really don't need full information on the total disadvantaged youth population". Several times it was intimated that perhaps getting adequate descriptive information about the youth who were actually in the youth work programs would really supply the needed information.

Without any doubt the overwhelming concensus of the workshop after discussion was to reject these suggestions and affirm the essentiality of

adequate target population research and information. Planning of a comprehensive and integrated youth work program requires this information, as fully and as precisely as possible. There are significant differences among poverty youth as the many aspects of identification that were proposed made clear, and the very fact that not all youngsters can be cared for makes even more essential information for wise selection and program emphasis. Moreover, it is the "kids who don't come in"— the "hard core"— whose identity and characteristics are so important in an effective youth work program.

There was general acknowledgement that the 1960 census data becomes increasingly outdated and in some regards is even misleading for youth work planning purposes. For example, one community representative pointed out that, "In our situation, no Puerto Ricans show in the 1960 statistics — yet this is an exploding population in our area . . ." Since it will be five or six years before new census data for 1970 becomes available, the relevance of the 1960 data becomes steadily more and more limited. Furthermore, leaving aside the problem of its being outdated, census data never supplied much of the information necessary on a local basis for effective youth-work planning.

The real usefulness and even necessity of much more developed target population research emerged when consideration was given to planning a fully integrated and comprehensive program to meet the needs of unemployed youth. Such planning requires many choices and assignment of varying priorities, both among youths in the poverty category, among programs, and between alternative supplementary services. The question was asked whether "absence of target population information actually affects planning" since "you can implement the Neighborhood Youth Program on the bsais of a gross estimate of out-of-school, out-of-work kids and go right ahead and get your program . . ." There was agreement that both NYC and Job Corps projects could get started on that basis, but with the further observation that, "when we are speaking of the unemployed youth, **per se,** to give quality to the total program, to counseling, institutional MDTA, to OJT, to Job Corps, or NYC . . . the most essential thing which has been missing" is adequate target population information to permit "identification of youths according to particular programs and services". Another participant said that the emphasis on target population research has its validity "only if it's used in connection with a highly centralized and closely coordinated program".

The particularly crucial role of this research in **future** program planning and in **changing** existing plans was summarized:

"There is a role for CAP and all those concerned in a local community program to be knowledgeable about their Target Population, not only to make the present programs work well, but because this information is the basic and perhaps the only guide to change in the programs. Unless we have this information and use it in a programmatic way, it is difficult to see how the program will ever make significant and intelligent changes."

Another need for Target Population information is for purposes of evaluation of the program and its various components. Without this knowledge as a starting point of base line information it is impossible to determine the effectiveness of the program, to measure success or failure of the services provided. Other subsidiary uses of this information were suggested: to withstand local political pressures that would turn the program away from legitimate first priorities; to minimize the bad effects of competition between the program components for the same youths resulting from lack of proper guiding target group information as well as lack of overall coordination; to avoid errors in and serve as a guide for corrective changes in youth-work legislation; to develop and maintain community support.

What information is needed?

The purposes for which Target Population information is to be used suggests what is needed. While the workshop did not catalogue all the classes of data to be desired, those mentioned showed the wide range of potential application:

Sex — The program required for boys is importantly different than that for girls.

Age — The problem of serving the needs of the 16 year-old jobless youth out of school is different than that of the 19 year-old.
Does a youth-work program really only start at age 16 and stop at age 21?

Nationality and Language — Are there special problems of culture, inability to speak and write English?

Educational level — Are the dropouts at grade 9 or 11? What is the reading level?

Health and Physical Handicaps — How extensive are physical problems hampering employability and employment? What are they? Are they remediable?

Family Status — How many one-parent homes? Are the families on relief? Are there special family problems? Slum dwelling, family unemployment?

Juvenile Delinquency — How many of the youth have records? For what kinds of offenses? How many on probation or parole?

Location — Does transportation to counseling, work, training, or other services present a problem? What is geographical location of youth?

It was recognized that these data cannot be exact, but definite dimensions and proportions are realizable and desirable. The alternative of vague generalizations does not fill the needs for program planning and development. "As fast as possible we should have a pretty good idea in our communities of what types of people we have in what category according to their needs". In actuality this is not the case, and the need for information continues and even grows as time permits development of more complete and varied programs. This requires more sophisticated planning which in turn needs a much more complete base of Target Population data.

Emphasis was given in the Workshop to the fact that the Target Population itself is constantly changing and therefore requiring continuing updated research. As one participant put it, "It is necessary to constantly take the pulse of the community". The fact that the census data have gone stale in five years reflects the myriad changes of mobility and trends affecting the unemployed youth population. Among the most important and real factors causing such change is the changing of economic conditions and the rate of unemployment — the Target Population of young jobless is different when the jobless rate in a given labor market area is 3 percent rather than 6 percent. This is a change that has widely occurred and may well shift again, possibly in an opposite direction. Such constant change in the target population suggested to the workshop that research had to be a continuing process, preferably built right into the youth-work program at the very outset.

How to get adequate Target Population data?

There was general agreement as to the urgency of much fuller information about the Target Population, but when the practical means of achieving this aim were discussed there was much uncertainty. Discussion and questions related to what the federal and state agencies should do and to the role of the community anti-poverty agencies in gathering adequate data.

Participants felt that much more local target population information is needed from federal and state government research facilities. Emphasis was

on local data, and there were constant notes of impatience with national and statewide statistics which could not be applied in any practical way to localities where the operating and planning decisions had to be made. Evidently there have been various suggestions and perhaps rumors of community studies underway, but they have not appeared in actuality. Comment was made of "plans afoot" for more than a year by the State Employment Services to gather local labor market information. Questions were raised about the possibility of the Census Bureau conducting local surveys. While there was no definite answer to this query, the impression was that at present the Census Bureau is not set to do such small scale surveys at costs possible for local users. The fact of interstate labor mobility and labor market interconnection (as, for example, between Northern New Jersey and metropolitan New York City) underlines the need of federal labor market research sufficient to identify both the demand and supply forces affecting youth unemployment. The clear consensus was that the Labor Department with its Bureau of Labor Statistics and Employment Service should be the main source of federal provision of local Target Population information.

The emphasis on the need for federal research did not eliminate serious consideration of community responsibility and potential in gathering of information about disadvantaged jobless youth. The experiences already had in attempting to gather this information, were enlarged by suggestions to use local and state welfare funds and agencies for such research. The prospects of private research resources being available under CAP subcontract was suggested. CAP was considered to have the main responsibility for developing the necessary research which would relate to many of its components.

Special interest was shown in the possible use of indigenous personnel for Target Population research surveys. It was reported that in Utica, New York, the Neighborhood Youth Corps used some of its enrollees to conduct a survey of the unemployed in the area. Also in Chicago and Detroit door-to-door surveys are underway to gather information about the Target Population. Much interest was shown in these efforts and it is clear that more, and more prompt, sharing of such experiences would be extremely helpful to all communities. Information is needed quickly about the actual techniques of survey and research with at least tentative estimates of success or failure.

Plans for built-in and continuing research were reported, with emphasis on operational evaluation as an integral part of the local manpower program. One community is designing a common application form or data sheet to be used by all programs in the area — NYC, YOC, Job Corps, MDTA, welfare, police — and which is expected to enlarge the knowledge about the Target Population in a coordinated and useful way.

A COMPREHENSIVE YOUTH-WORK PROGRAM

The session opened with the observation that unemployed youth "represent a wide range of ability and disability with regard to their readiness for entry into the world of work". Consequently, they may require different kinds of programs to increase their employability and subsequent employment. It was recognized that systematic knowledge about youth who require service is of great importance to an administrator in designing a comprehensive work program.

The Major Components of a Comprehensive Youth-Work Program

It was maintained that disadvantaged youth require a range of services that includes work evaluation, pre-vocational work experience, vocational skill training, job placement and supportive services.

A Work-Evaluation

Participants agreed upon the necessity to develop more satisfactory methods than now exist to differentiate youth in terms of their capabilities for training and work. A suitable designed work-evaluation program was seen as one possible way "to relieve some of the problems people have had with the use of formal tests". As one participant noted, "the basic problem of the formal test has been that one does not derive a good prediction as to how a youth is going to do on the job, and work evaluation is an attempt to develop a predictive instrument. . . . which could be used as one might use tests to provide a basis for assignment to pre-vocational training, occupational skill training, OJT, or regular employment".

It was agreed that "evaluating a young person's potential for work is an ongoing process that takes place no matter what the youth is doing". However, doubt was expressed about the need for creating a program in each community that was clearly designated as "work evaluation". Work evaluation, in its more limited sense was described as a device by which a youth could participate for a limited time in a variety of work tasks which are specifically designed to help him and the staff assess what should be the appropriate next steps. Reservations were expressed concerning the desireability of creating work-sample evaluation centers modeled after those which have developed in the field of vocational rehabiliation. These were viewed as providing a kind of "esoteric testing" and putting youngsters "on a merry-go-round" as he moves from one kind of work-sample to the next.

In general, the group felt that while work evaluation is important, it should not be seen as a separate function. Rather, it should be built into any work assignment undertaken by a youth including "where labor market conditions permit, placing him on one, two or three jobs in succession" and using his actual performance as the basis for planning. Stress was placed upon the central role of the counselor in providing continuous evaluation of all work experiences.

B. Pre-Vocational Work Experiences

It was felt by the participants that perhaps as much as 70% of youth applying for service are not ready, at the time of application, for placement in a regular job or vocational skill training program. They were viewed as lacking the degree of maturity, work tolerance and other job attributes required by disciplined work or training situations. This sizeable group of youth appears to profit from what has been called a pre-vocational work experience. (This term was used to describe actual work performed by youth under supervision in a somewhat protected environment. It was emphasized that this term should not be confused with work experiences provided in a sheltered workshop). The Neighborhood Youth Corps was seen as essentially a pre-vocational program in that it emphasizes more general kinds of work readiness rather than the acquisition of specific vocational skills. As one participant put it: "The mere fact that these youth require a great deal of supervision, counseling, and other supportive services, means that they are not really ready at the time they come into the Neighborhood Youth Corps to function adequately on the job". Such pre-vocational experiences, under NYC can be "exciting, meaningful, and possess status" even though they represent a "first-step process". One participant described it as an "employment Head Start program". Another described it as the "pre, before you set your sights. . . . it is part of the process before establishing some vocational goal".

C. Vocational Training

The term vocational training may be viewed as including a number of sub-components such as institutional training, on-the-job training and apprenticeship.

1. **Institutional Training** — This term was used to describe a form of vocational training provided in a specialized instructional facility as contrasted with training provided on-the-job. As one participant noted, "it's a model instructional program, an adult, vocational-instructional program". Usually, these training classes, made possible by MDTA, are conducted by

the public schools in a local community. The particular classes are determined by the existence of specific labor shortages for which the employment service then recruits and selects qualified applicants. It was also pointed out that under MDTA, individual applicants might be referred for vocational training to private trade schools if no suitable public program could be established or if the number of trainees were below classroom size. Some communities reported their use of such private facilities as schools of printing and beauty culture.

There was general agreement in the group that the so-called "multi-occupational" or "umbrella" program could provide a useful alternative to the more traditional single-occupation form. In the multi-occupational program, a youth is required to choose a general type of work rather than a particular occupation for which he would like to train. One example cited was that of a multi-occupational clerical center which ran "the full gamut from file clerk to legal stenographer. If the person has the ability and the aptitude to progress that far. . . . he may receive up to 104 weeks of training". On the other hand, a more vocational limited trainee may terminate training after he has acquired the skill necessary to perform as a file clerk. He may receive training for 20 weeks. Another example of such a program was for the food services trades where training could be provided for pantry men, short-order cooks and full chefs. (One participant noted that the multi-occupational idea emerged from earlier experience under MDTA in which "we tried to train lathe operators, but they never came out as lathe operators, they came out as drill-press operators".

Participants were uncertain whether multi-occupational programs could be funded under MDTA and sponsored by a local community group rather than by the board of education. This question was considered important because of the inclusion of related academic instruction as an integral part of vocational training. The group noted that often the schools can and do provide vocational education for out-of-school youth outside the framework of MDTA. For instance, one participant reported on "a practical nursing course available in our county vocational school". While there is generally a tuition charge for this education, "they have agreed to provide scholarships".

2. **On-the-job Training** (OJT) — This term was used to describe a training situation in which the youth is actually an employee receiving the usual wages and fringe benefits. OJT was viewed as an excellent way to provide training on a more flexible basis than the customary institutional form since it can be aranged for one or more trainees. One participant described his community's OJT program which seemed to be typical. "Our program will

permit us, as the community action agency, to be the prime contractor with the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training to set up subcontracts with private industry. We will jointly design the curriculum and we will reimburse the employer up to twenty-five dollars a week to train that individual in that specific job." It was noted that OJT was a particularly valuable method for upgrading the employed. It was seen as a way to "push somebody upstairs so you can get somebody in downstairs".

While some participants felt that an employer should commit himself to hiring the trainee after he completed the OJT, others felt that "some employers could be used as a training institute" with the graduates hired by other employers. This was seen as particularly valuable "in smaller communities where you do not have institutional facilities to train in a given area of employment but you do have a demonstrated need and reasonable expectation for that type of employment".

3. **Apprenticeship** — Participants reported very little experience with formal apprenticeship programs under the auspices of the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training. Some felt this may be due to the discriminatory patterns of apprenticeships in the craft occupations in addition to the difficult testing and other admission requirements. However, it was pointed out that the very existence of an apprenticeship program in a particular occupation would generally preclude the possibility of establishing an OJT program in that occupation because MDTA does not permit OJT in "an apprenticeable" trade. An example of this is tool-and-die makers, and machinists.

D. Supportive Services

It was recognized that in addition to the work experiences and work training noted above, additional services should be provided in local communities in order to meet other work-related needs of disadvantaged youth. One participant stated: "So many of these kids have health problems that really prevent them from being employable . . . and it really is a problem to get physical examinations and remedial health services that they need in order to make them employable". While some participants felt that a "pre-employment medical examination should be provided routinely to each youngster", it was reported that in one program "25% of the kids were lost in the working-paper process . . . in which they must be examined by the city doctor". Another reported "We find the business of going to the school, to the health department, to the x-ray center and back is quite a difficult hurdle to overcome. We are trying to decide whether we would get a St.

Bernard dog to take them through this type of thing or try to change the procedure".

There seemed to be agreement that funds should be made available to work programs so they could provide their own medical examinations in order to prevent unnecessary loss of trainees. As one participant noted, "if somebody gave the money to bring in a doctor, we'd give it to them right away — but, if you've got to get them free, you've got to wait for somebody to give it to you at their sweet time".

While time did not permit a full discussion of remedial education it was noted that both the Economic Opportunity Act and the Primary and Secondary School Education Act of 1965 provide funds for remedial education for youth in work programs.

Since these remedial education services would be provided through existing state educational systems many participants believed there would be limitations on what could be accomplished at the local community level. Nevertheless, one participant wondered "How vigilant we all have been in pursuing these new opportunities".

THE PLANNING OF A COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM

The group agreed on the need for the existence of a comprehensive program at the local level. As one participant noted, "We've had experience with non-comprehensive youth work programs, which leads me to conclude, we have gotten ourselves into one of the fixes we now face with youth because we haven't been comprehensive, so we have to do more than we are doing". The concept of comprehensiveness was related to the provision of a variety of program services linked together by some coordinating body such as a CAP: it also was viewed as a method of bringing to bear on behalf of a youth all the varied services which he might require. For example, there was some discussion about the potential value of "the Neighborhood Service Center . . . . to which a youth would come irrespective of the program he requires, and this would be the anchor point around which one could try to make sure that he gets everything he needs and everything the community can offer". The group was in strong agreement that regardless of the manner in which the community's agencies organized themselves to provide service, it is essential that some **one** staff person assume responsibility for helping the youth to make use of all available programs.

In addition to the question of coordination, the group also discussed centralization. Examples were cited of communities which were too small in size to warrent the creation of certain expensive programs. In discussing

the need for a multi-occupational course, one state-wide executive reported "we can only do it effectively, efficiently, in terms of centralizing it where facilities exist, faculty is possible and where we can centralize enough people to make the course productive and economical". He went on to comment upon the suggestion that "we have an itinerant placement service which would move on schedule from community to community. Itinerancy is fine if all you want to do is provide people with the opportunity of saying that they saw someone from some service and have had a conversation with someone".

In discussing NYC programs, one participant noted, as another argument for centralization, "it takes the federal government about as much time to process a contract for twenty-five kids as it does for 3000, and it's just as economical to service 3000 in one contract as it is to serve 3000 with a hnudred contracts of little scope".

The problem of the possible need for greater centralization received very lively attention from the group. While no agreement or recommendation was sought, there seemed to be considerable interest in the statement of one participant who said, "maybe a metropolitan approach will be the answer. It's coming, and I think that OEO should consider a metropolitan approach in which the large, urban center will be the core but the services will be provided on a cost basis to suburban areas. For instance, in the case of the Neighborhood Youth Corps, it is totally unrealistic to expect that every small community will be funded when their population does not warrant it. Yet they certainly should not be left out".

The group then turned to a discussion of the role which the CAP should play in coordinating programs. Participants noted that there were differing perceptions of CAP's role at the local level. "It's some contract-writing group, some proposal pipe-line", "a marriage boker", "a traffic cop", "a State Department that negotiates treaties and coordinates delicate matters", "the best method of mobilizing a number of resources through a group most responsible to the people in the community", and "what right has that new outfit to come in and coordinate us?" While the entire group recognized the many problems faced by local CAP's in establishing both their identity and their role, nevertheless there seemed to be a strong hope that CAP's would prove to be a significant addition to the community's capacity to meet presently unmet needs. One participant expressed his hopes in the following way, "most institutions right now, the ones that exist, including the churches, are involved in saving the saved and serving the people who have the most going for them, and the people we are trying to deal with, and the whole reason why we have a community action program is to work with those people who heretofore have not been reached".

RECRUITMENT

In this discussion the first task was to define the goals of the youth recruitment efforts of work programs and describe what is meant by a genuinely balanced participation reflecting sensible priorities of service for the target population. Then attention was given to the problems and difficulties of achieving these goals, and suggestions were developed for ways and means of overcoming the barriers to successful recruitment.

There was not much indication of any **general** recruitment problem in the sense that not enough needy young people were available to fill youth-work program openings. With regard to the Neighborhood Youth Corps nationally it was stated by a member of the federal staff, "we don't have that problem. In most cities we have more kids than we can serve . . . Actually we've got many projects that came into Washington that we haven't even looked at because there just isn't the money to fund them all . . ." On the other hand problems in recruitment were encountered in the Manpower Development and Training Act programs, and in Job Corps recruitment in certain areas. One participant said, "your recruitment problem is in the area of vocational training because when you get to MDTA training, we are, again, trying to get people to do something which they have not been successful with in the past".

The problem of MDTA recruitment seemed to be only partly related to the differences between MDTA training allowances of approximately $20 a week compared with an NYC income of $37.50 weekly. A special Job Corps recruitment difficulty was related: "We went to the police department to recruit for the Job Corps program. In an area of more than 4 million people we had one hell of a time recruiting a couple of hundred Job Corps kids. We enlisted the aid of about everybody we could think of, including the police. The police gave us a list of names, hoping we could find the kids".

Other points were raised relating to the general problem of recruitment. It was suggested that, "maybe the pool is not as great at any one given time as the statistics might indicate . . . I wonder whether the problems of recruitment might not be tied to the definition of what we call the unemployed population". This participant was referring to such factors as the actual unavailability at any given time for work or training of unwed mothers, youth in institutions or before courts, and youngsters "on the move". Another made just the opposite point, that due to lack of information many needy people have not appeared in the statistics of those available for youth work programs. It was also suggested that due to the current tight labor market and the increased draft calls there is "a creeping development which may be changing the character of the recruitment problem, making

it necessary to have a tougher and more militant outreach program, to be more creative in recruiting the really disadvantaged youth . . ."

Some the typical difficulties in recruitment were described as follows: "In our city, we have had the problem of enrollment red tape, the problem with the local-state employment office, the problem with working papers, the problem with fingerprinting." In this city, the NYC youth were "blanketed into the civil service" and it was required that they be fingerprinted at the police department although this regulation was being at least partially ignored while the practice was "still in the debating stage". Spelling out the process a workshop participant reported "all our kids had to go to our office, then to the state employment office for an assignment, for a test period, for an evaluation; back to our office for the working-paper deal after getting their papers at the city hall, and to the doctor at the health department for chest x-rays".

Originally this process was said to take "two or three weeks because I'd send them to the state employment office; they'd meet them and then set a date when they could be tested, 'next Thursday', 'a week from Tuesday' or something. However, if the kids were two minutes late for the appointment for testing, then they couldn't start and had to have another appointment. This is another rule. After testing, they would be told they'd be called up and asked to come in again to evaluate the testing, and most of the time they never called. Eventually they wandered back to my office, saying, 'What's going on?' I said 'I don't know' ". In this city, the procedure has been improved so that the intake process lasts only a day and a half.

One response to this description of recruitment difficulties reflected the general view that, "This was not, basically, a recruitment problem; it's an operating problem" and it was added, "The point you are learning by experience is that you must have a planned program in which you also orient the trainees prior to processing as to what they are to expect. When we tell them in advance what they are going to be exposed to and why, we don't have this problem. If you just give them a card and say 'report over there for a medical,' and then they are given another card and told 'go over there and get fingerprinted,' this is when you lose them. But, if we handle the program, streamline it and inform the kids, I don't think this is a problem".

The real problem of recruitment which concerned every program operator was the achievement of a balanced group recruited, selected and enrolled. The overriding problem was expressed as the danger of "recruitment effort producing a group of youngsters who are all of one ethnic background, for instance in some communities, all Negro youngsters". To this

a government agency participant reported that "insofar as the Neighborhood Youth Corps is concerned — we don't like to see all-anything, unless that in fact is the make-up of the community. We do want to see that the racial composition reflects the racial composition of the poverty group and, if its an all-Negro community, of course, that's de facto segregation which we aren't equipped at this time to do anything about . . ."

There was a feeling that the NYC guidelines to handle the problem of racial balance have been at least inadequate. One comment was that they have been "misleading", a view based on the charge that in setting up some programs "there was a clear insinuation that, insofar as the disadvantaged group was concerned, it related almost wholly to the disadvantaged Negro population in the target areas . . . Furthermore the program for a Neighborhood Youth Corps proposed that two store-front, neighborhood employment offices be set up, and each one was located in a segregated Negro area. But this city has a very poor Italian population and the program — not with malice — provided no reference or provision for this group . . ."

There was considerable agreement that a problem exists in many areas of an "assumption by the white Target Population that these programs are only for the Negro minority, the Negro disadvantaegd". A particular imbalance between Negro youth and Catholic youth was noted. "The Negro kids come to the door in droves, but the Monsignor says 'we don't have any poor here". In another area the same problem was reported and explained: "The Negro kids are involved themselves or through parents in Negro organizations. The word can get around, whereas, the white kids very often are totally unorganized . . . The only organization there might be for some of the white kids in ..... would be the Church, and there is some feeling that the Catholics don't want to admit too much poverty and are reluctant to send their kids over . . ."

Another recruitment balance related to proportions of male and females. It was reported that there is no set proportion in NYC for males and females and that girls are certainly included "as well as males". Everyone agreed that there is no particular difficulty in recruiting girls — one report was "just the opposite".

Although not developed extensively or in depth, there was recognition of special difficulty in recruiting the real hard-core disadvantaged youth. This is reflected in what has become almost a cliche definition of the hard-core as "those who don't come in". As one person put it "Too often we have been getting the better motivated economically deprived person . . ."

A barrier to recruitment, it was agreed, was that "some people are very reluctant to identify themselves as being in need". There was a question

regarding the possible adverse image within the target population of the "poverty program" and the effect this had on recruitment. To this it was responded that "perhaps in some communities the program has a negative image, but in the total picture it's completely positive". One proposal was "It's the way the things are presented to us that makes the difference. We are all fiercely proud people. . . . We have taken the word 'poverty' out of our language in my area, and we use 'opportunity'. We don't say 'target area', we say 'opportunity area'. We call it an 'opportunity program' ".

One appraisal suggested that insofar as recruitment is concerned "The shear newness of the program raises questions. The greater the extent to which these work programs are effective, the more comprehensive they are, the better the fit of the program to the needs of the population the greater will be the capability to recruit . . ."

A number of proposals of methods to improve recruitment were presented. There was a growing recognition of the need for a positive and planned "outreach program". "All of a sudden, I took a good look and discovered we were about ninety five percent a Negro group. . . . I suggested a better effort to get us a more balanced group. So we went out with definite recruitment into the Puerto Rican and white areas where there is a great deal of poverty." The point was made that recruitment has to go on "constantly . . . there can be no end to the process of going out and searching for them . . . bringing them in".

There was a warning against "centralizing the point of recruitment" with the result "you get only one group". Instead it was urged that recruitment be decentralized on the basis of "knowing the racial make-up of the areas and advanced planning". In the same vein, it was urged that recruitment personnel be selected so as to encourage balanced results. The question was raised whether when particular agencies such as the Urban League or the Jewish Vocational Service, or the Catholic Youth Organizations are operating the youth work programs, "their particular characteristics have a selective impact on recruitment".

Objection was taken to the emphasis on decentralization of recruitment stations—"I don't think the location of the office where the actual processing takes place makes the slightest bit of difference; it depends entirely on what kind of an outreach program you've got . . ." Four types of outreach were described (1) "Storefront satellite type" offices (2) "street-workers to go out and contact people at random (3) publicity, speaker's Bureau, committees, and (4) "a mobile unit in which you work block by block, or neighborhood by neighborhood".

"Neighborhood Planning Teams" set up by CAP to do a variety of things

were suggested as effective recruiting units. Successful use of indigenous personnel for recruitment was reported in some areas.

SCREENING AND SELECTION

The session on screening and selection focused upon those work program activities which are intended to assess an applicant's eligibility and vocational readiness for particular training programs or employment. A number of significant issues associated with screening and selection had been discussed at previous sessions: for example, the value of testing and work evaluation, the consequences of cumbersome application procedures, and the difficulty of validating the age of an applicant as a criterion of eligibility. This session concentrated largely upon the issues raised by newly promulgated family income criteria for enrollment of youth in the NYC, the verification of an applicant's statement of family income, the reduction of "dropouts" during screening and selection, and the consequences of rejecting applicants for the work program.

Income Criteria for Enrollment in NYC

These criteria elicited an often heated discussion. A number of participants were decidedly opposed to standards which limited enrollment, for example, to urban youths in families of four with annual incomes of $3,130 or less, and to youths in families of seven or more with annual incomes of $5,090 or less.[1] Their views were reflected in the following brief memorandum prepared by one participant prior to the workshop, and read to the group.

Financial Standard of Eligibility for Enrollment in the Neighborhood Youth Corps, November 2, 1965

The rigid application of exclusively financial criteria to determine poverty, and hence eligibility for service, is grossly inadequate and misleading. Whatever knowledge we have of poverty, its causes and effects, confirms the view that it is a complicated phenomenon with multiple sociocultural aspects. The implicit definition of poverty as merely lack of money, reflected in the singular emphasis on income level, is simple-minded and tragically deficient. The rich promise of the Neighborhood Youth Corps as a program which can intervene at a critical point in a youngster's life will be seriously inhibited, and quite

1 Program Standard No. 1-65, "Standards for Enrollment of Youth in Neighborhood Youth Corps Projects", U. S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Washington, D. C., July 8, 1965.

possibly lost, unless the multiple causes of poverty and social dysfunctioning are also considered in determining whom the program will serve.

The implications of exclusion work destructively in two directions:

1. the effect on the program internally;
2. the effect on the image of the NYC, and through it of the CAP.

In regard to the former, the program is seriously crippled in its ability to reach the most needful (including the "poorest") since this requirement does not allow the recruitment of key leaders, particularly in the out-of-school group. It forbids the kind of group mix that is so necessary for the kind of involvement which can lead to an internalized change in the individual's view of himself and his world. Although NYC is aimed in large measure at the prevention of later social and economic dependency, the income requirement excludes so many who need the program that it cannot fulfill this aim. One need only note the arbitrary descrimination against such groups as the physically and mentally handicapped, the so-called affluent delinquent, the emotionally disturbed, etc., to realize that the reliance on rigid income standards, while simplifying the administration of NYC, is most harmful to its purpose.

The second generally destructive implication of this rigidity involves the image of the NYC in the total community, and hence, its effectiveness. To limit membership only to those who are economically destitute, without regard for other needs or motivations inevitably labels the total program in a way so as to discourage teenagers from participating. As NYC becomes identified as the "failures", as the "misfits", as the "government handout program", youngsters who can also benefit from it will be effectively barred from involvement. The income requirement, unless flexibly administered, will bring all these negative aspects and seriously jeopardize the success of the program.

The discussion of the issues contained in the memorandum appeared to revolve around three basic questions: What are the goals of the NYC program? What is the intended target population of the NYC program? Can the new income criteria be applied with sufficient flexibility to meet the needs of disadvantaged youth?

The Goals of the NYC Program

Those who supported the viewpoint contained in the memorandum were basically, "trying to get more mileage out of the NYC program than just giving youngsters a work experience". They were not, however, attempting

to denigrate the significance of a work experience. On the contrary, the work experience was viewed not only as an end in itself, but the lure which attracts "the physically and mentally handicapped, the so-called affluent delinquent, [and] the emotionally disturbed" into the NYC program.

In some communities, the NYC was used to integrate various major elements of the anti-poverty program at the local level. As one participant pointed out: "There is an explicit instruction that these [anti-poverty] programs are to be related, one to the other — the Neighborhood Youth Corps to Title V to CAP. It runs through the whole gamut of the programs. The point is that you are to develop a comprehensive program in your community to eliminate or ameliorate poverty, but the problem is that we see NYC in all these programs. I just don't think that the mere fact that we provide somebody with a job solves the problem. But, we begin to when we relate this program to others. That's why I am asking for a removal of the rigidity of the NYC eligibility".

A number of participants, particularly those from smaller communities, viewed the NYC as the means for reaching special problem youth, such as the delinquent and the mildly handicapped, for whom specialized services and agencies are not available. In such communities vocational guidance services, delinquency prevention and control programs, rehabilitation agencies and the like do not exist or are in very short supply. The point is, as one participant suggested, that, "if you have a community in which NYC is one of only a very few programs available, you will want to expand it and make it as flexible as possible. This may involve slipping our guidelines because you want to get as much out of it as you can".

This view of the NYC program was not shared by all participants. Others held that the suggested expansion of the intent of NYC endangered the success of the program by defining objectives which it was not established to achieve. One participant, for example, pointed out that, "We are forgetting some of the things we have railed against in earlier workshop discussions. We must consider the fact that only 30% of the NYC funds can be allocated for supportive services. If you want to provide supportive services for delinquent and handicapped kids, you have to go outside of the NYC program".

A number of participants, in fact, did suggest that other more appropriate agencies in the community should be responsible for treating special problem youth. In communities where specialized agencies do not exist or do not have the capacity to serve all those who require service, it was suggested that, "The CAP ought to stimulate the development of these several services for all youngsters". Others pointed out the current NYC procedures

permit the enrollment of youth, "who have physicial and mental handicaps, provided that they are not so serious as to endanger themselves or others, or that they cannot perform the job to which they are assigned".

Lastly, there were some participants who saw some potential distortion in the image of the NYC program and in the criteria used to enroll youth, if the program's objectives were expanded as suggested. This concern was reflected in the following comment: "We are asked to take kids above income who have certain kinds of social problems by reason of their delinquency, handicaps and so on. Does this mean that we will punish the kid who is not a delinquent whose family earns $4000, but we will reward another kid whose family income is the same, because he has been cutting up or worse?"

The Target Population for the NYC Program

Workshop participants who supported the new income criteria argued that Congress intended that the NYC program should serve the "poorest of the poor". However strenuous one's objections to this position may be, it is mandatory to begin with this fact. As one participant noted: "It's all right to say that we are from localities, but we are dealing with a national program legislated by Congress, and that's where we start. You have to pay attention (1) to the intent of the Congress as it put it into the law, and (2) even more importantly, the intent [of Congress] as it's put into the appropriations. Now, that means that this is not a program for the poor: this is a program for the poorest. It is not a program for the disadvantaged or the problem youth: it is a program for the **poorest** disadvantaged and problem youth. If Congress had said: 'we are giving you money to take care of out-of-work, out-of-school kids', then they would have given you about three times as much money — but, they didn't. Therefore, you face the inevitable problem of excluding a certain number of legitimate cases, and you have to decide who's to be excluded".

The contention that the NYC was intended to serve only the "poorest of the poor" was supported by what were assumed to be the reasons for promulgating a more stringent set of income criteria. This change, which was described as administrative rather than legislative, was intended to reduce the "tremendous amount of abuse [of the old income criteria]. There were many kids in specific communities who could have been included — who were poor and who needed it — but were not included. The feeling is that if there is money left over, it is desirable to include everyone for whom you have sufficient funds". In addition, since the demand for the NYC program has exceeded expectations, the more restrictive income

criteria was seen as a means of limiting enrollment to a number which could be supported by available funds.

Some participants suggested that those who were advocating expansion of the present income criteria, "were trying to justify a poor selection job". One participant pointed out that, "the (NYC) program was designed for a specific group of people, but in some instances we haven't reached that group. Instead, we have filled our quotas with people who were willing to enroll, but who did not meet the eligibility requirements". Another suggested that, "what you are told by this income limitation is: don't take the easy route of recruitment. You've got to work a lot harder; you've got to dig a lot deeper; you've got to have a more forceful and determined outreach program."

In response, proponents of a more flexible set of income criteria maintained that income alone does not enable you to reach the most deprived youth. To support this position, one participant reported what he regarded as an analagous experience with a pre-school program. "We recruited 500 children for the pre-school program in the disadvantaged area of C..... We got disadvantaged, low-income children by the definition given us. We did not, in our opinion, get the deprived, or sufficiently deprived population, and found that our program had to be reworked." In essence, it was maintained that enrollment in NYC must be determined by an assessment of individual applicants, and not arbitrarily on the basis of income limitations. The families of those who are most in need of an NYC experience, though over income, "may still be living in a slum neighborhood suffering with substandard housing, poor education, racial discrimination, the whole bit. I think youngsters in these circumstances should be in the NYC programs".

Indeed, one participant was of the opinion that, you are more likely to find the raw recruit for the [NYC] program "among families with income of three to five thousand dollars". Another acknowledged that "we do not have a great deal of experience in recruiting. We do not know, precisely, the out-of-school, out-of-work population for the hundred enrollees we are going to take in. We do have an idea of how we want to use the NYC program, and that is to control some of the gang activity in and around X..... We want to use NYC as part of our bag of tricks. The point is that we know we are going to run into many kids in gangs who are over-income by definition". A third participant, nettled by the suggestion that the memorandum quoted above may be a mask for a poor recruitment process, retorted that, "we were told in so many words by the Labor Department that we cannot recruit ahead of time [presumably, before the official starting date of the NYC contract]. Now, mind you, there is me and my assistant only, with no

agencies to assist. They then give you twenty-one days from the point of approval to do this: this is impossible. . . . Suddenly, you find yourself about to lose a program because you can't fill the slots, so you give the jobs to anybody who shows up".

In summary, one participant said, "unless you permit some administrative exceptions to these income criteria you aren't going to get the best kind of NYC program. It cannot be considered only on emplyoment program for the poorest. I would resent and resist such an interpretation and I wouldn't have the program in my city".

Flexibility in application of Income Criteria

Opponents of the view that income criteria must be more flexibly administered maintained that sufficient flexibility already exists. Some noted that the criteria were intended to serve as a guide which permits regional variation, although a few participants held that localities should not vary standards established by a national program. It was also suggested that if exceptions were desired, "it is possible to contact your regional office and get an O.K. Then write the case up so that if the auditors come through you have your documentation as well as the approval of the regional office. I don't believe, unless the office in Washington has misled us, that you will have much difficulty in a case of that nature". Others agreed that, "you have some loopholes, provided you protect yourself". Lastly, it was suggested that, "no one [NYC auditors or monitors] ever gripes if eighty or ninety percent of the enrollees were the kind they think the program was designed for. They don't consider that 'abuse'. I don't think anybody ever expected that we would design a program where everyone you get is under $3000".

Those who advocated greater flexibility in the application of income criteria insisted that it was necessary to account for regional variation in level of income. In addition, one participant pointed out that, "to a private agency, a 'guideline' is something you use to set up a program, but you don't necessarily have to conform to it completely. To the government agency, a 'guideline' is a mandatory rule you don't vary from. We have to get clear on this fundamental difference. If the ruling of $3000 is a guideline in the sense that it's a base to touch then we have no argument. I think it's a good guideline for a national program. So you have twenty kids above it. What difference does it make? But, if it's a ruling you can't vary, then it's an entirely different matter".

Most complaints referred to the "rigidity" with which income criteria

were supposed to be applied. One participant, while tacitly admitting that in practice loopholes may be found, nevertheless maintained that exceptions should be "expressed in legal language"; i.e., in guidelines or directives. He felt that the failure officially to acknowledge these exceptions left local programs vulnerable to criticism. He then related the following incident: "Just before I came to this workshop, I had two two-hour sessions with the Herald and Traveller [newspapers]. They asked me all kinds of questions about the enrollees — who they are, where they lived, etc., and I told them. Then this literally happened: the Traveller guy called his editor and said 'they're clean', and put the phone down. This is the kind of thing that is going on, and I think the rigidity of the requirements lends itself to the newspapers' intense desire, if they wish, to discredit or to sell newspapers".

Recommendations

A number of recommendations were made for relieving the presumed rigidity of present income standards for admission to the NYC. Some participants advocated retention of the income criteria, but requested a ruling which would permit 10-25% of the total number of youths enrolled in local NYC programs to be over-income. What the upper income limit of this group should be was not indicated, but such youth would manifest the "social and cultural effects of poverty". In addition, there was a willingness "to document those instances where we go over income; that we prove the necessity of entering an over-income enrollee in our program".

One participant offered the following recommendation: "The new criteria show a ceiling for families of six or more of approximately $5200. Now we have many families in our community with twelve and fourteen kids, and to have a top figure at that level is absolutely absurd. Why shouldn't that go up, indefinitely, so much per child for as many children as there are"?

Another participant recommended drastic revisions in the income scale, along the following lines: "The point is that poverty is defined as $3000 or below. I define poverty at the $5000 level. They are all poor at $3000, $4000 or $5000: in our society it's the same income. You won't unfairly deprive a kid an opportunity because you accept another kid whose family income is $500, $1000, or even $2000 more. The scale is wrong to begin with".

Discussion of these recommendations elicited numerous criticisms and qualifications. Some were critical of the last stated proposal in particular

because of the difficulty of identifying and justifying an appropriate income "ceiling" by family size. However, it was reported that, "The Community Council of New York City, a year or two ago, had developed a scale of what was necessary to maintain any kind of decent living for a family of four. This was estimated to be $6200 in New York City". In rebuttal, another participant felt that the problem to which these statistics related had little to do with the Neighborhood Youth Corps. "What you need to do", he said, "is to persuade your legislators to revise the welfare laws. You will help a lot more people in your community by getting them up to a standard of $6000, than by increasing the income requirements for 100 youths in NYC". It was also suggested that, "to exceed the ceiling at random might entail conflicts with the regulations of existing agencies. For example, any family with more than six members earning only $5000 can get supplementary support from the Welfare Department".

Participants seemed to be agreed that if it was desirable to increase income criteria, some equitable formual could be found for determining a new scale based upon regional variations in income. A suggestion that eligibility for enrollment in NYC should be considered solely in terms of the "needs of people", was greeted with sympathy and assent by other participants, but it was also considered to be "infeasable" and "not fundable". The proponent of this approach declared: "I agree that we should not look at the issue before us in terms of programs but in terms of the needs of people. But, the recommendations offered are excessively timid. What are you asking for? You are asking for small potatoes — for 10% flexibility. Why not say that any youngster is eligible for NYC who is out-of-work, out-of-school and who needs counseling, or work experience or vocational training. In short, any out-of-school, out-of-work youngster, regardless of income would be eligible if he needs help to become more employable. After all, you don't have to have cancer and a coronary to need help; one is enough. Similarly, it is enough that a kid is out of work, out of school and needs intervention — that he can't make it on his own". Further, the speaker pointed out that, "MDTA has no income cut-off".

Verifying Income Information

Participants discussed a series of questions associated with the process of authenticating income information supplied by an applicant for the NYC. In many work programs, efforts to validate income information are undertaken after the applicant has completed the intake process. In one work program, "the youth is given a form for his parent to sign which states the level of income, or if it's a case that comes through welfare, we check with

the Welfare Department to establish the income level of the family. We find that not all welfare families fall within the income categories (of NYC)." In other work programs, youngsters are asked, "to bring in a recent pay stub. In the case of seasonal employment, you ask for a W-2 form".

There was considerable doubt about how intensive efforts at authentication should be. One participant, "understood that, officially, there is no requirement for verification". Others felt that there was, but it should not go so far as "to destroy the acceptance of NYC in the local community". It was suggested, for example, that requesting "W-2 forms and income-tax forms is becoming a little too personal. Are we here to render service or to investigate families"? It was also noted that though NYC has not identified any specific rules for verifying income data, nevertheless work programs will be held responsible for establishing sensible administrative judgment on matters of this kind. As one participant expressed it: "You have to have some system. The auditors don't care what your system is, as long as you have a system".

Workshop participants also addressed the question: Since children do not usually know what their parents earn, are we creating an awkard family situation by asking a youth to inquire and obtain proof of his family's earnings? Some felt it was not a problem since youths in disadvantaged families, unlike middle class families, generally knew what their parents were earning. Others believed it was a problem. "We just run rough-shod over people, as we have to, in order to get the statistics and run a program." Most participants believed it was not necessary to permit the need for income information to create family tensions. Alternatives exist. For example, it was noted that, "we have already narrowed our population down to the disadvantaged areas. You can tell from a youngster's address what his family's average income level is". In addition, reasonable estimates of an applicant's family income can be made by determining whether he bears other marks of social and economic deprivation — e.g., a history of delinquency, a school dropout, low occupational skills, excessive unemployment or underemployment.

"Dropouts" during Screening and Selection

Only a brief discussion ensued concerning applicants who dropout of the work program during the screening and selection period. According to most participants the length of this period contributes to a high percentage of dropouts. As one participant noted, "in the beginning it was two or three weeks before we could get the kid on the job, and we lost about 20% of them. But, we don't do that again". Instead, "your first look has to deter-

mine whether a youth is eligible, and if he is, get him into the program before you do your verification. In the end, you may have to let him go, but if you hold off and wait two or three days or a week, he is gone". Others pointed out that rapid assignment to a job or training slot was particularly necessary for "hard-core" youth.

Provisions for NYC Rejectees

Participants were agreed that, "no kid should be turned away". However, most of the work programs represented at the workshop have not yet acquired a full complement of work and training components (see section on "Comprehensive Work Programs"). Nevertheless, a number of participants reported the procedures they had instituted for serving youth who could not be accepted into the NYC or other existing projects.

In one instance a youth work program was, "trying to work with Rotary, Kiwanis, the service clubs, and the Chamber to set up a teenage employment service". Similar arrangements were being attempted in other communities. In another community, the work program and the employment service were attempting to develop procedures which would ensure that, "none of the kids get turned down. They'll be placed in a job in industry, in MDTA or in another federal training program or something". Lastly, one work program reported that, "during this past summer, every boy or girl who applied, who was over-income, we nonetheless placed them and gave them some counseling, testing, or did some work with them. Everybody got some service. For example, we used them as custodians rather than hiring custodians. We used our CAP money and shared the largess. It wasn't much, but every kid likes to have a bit of change in his pockets".

Participants raised a series of questions, few of which could be neatly resolved. For example, "we have a problem with the 16 and 17 year-old individuals who are not eligible for private industry employment; and, in the case of 16 year-old youths, are also not eligible for training allowances under MDTA". A much more controversial question was raised about the proportion of NYC rejectees who were qualified for direct placement, even in entry-level jobs, (with no age, educational skill, or previous experience requirements) at the time they apply to the work program? One participant stated that the experience of the employment service in his community indicated that over 80% of the youth are qualified. However, this estimate was later qualified by the admission that the Employment Service may not attract the truly disadvantaged or hard-core youth. Fruther, even the youths who apply to the Employment Service "aren't ready for long-term employ-

ment;" and, while "they are ready to go to work in this very tight labor market, in a normal or loose market, they'd be hung up".

Many participants doubted that 80% of the disadvantaged youth were qualified for immediate placement, even in unskilled jobs. One thought that this might be more nearly true of "the more affluent kids, but even they don't know how to present themselves for a job". Most disadvantaged youth were considered to be in need of "vocational guidance" or "pre-vocational training". One participant was of the opinion that "utilizing immediate placement, indiscriminately, as a stop-gap measure is a dangerous approach. Business owners and managers in our community inform us that there is a considerable problem with an unstable adult work force. All we do is add to this problem if we pour kids into the labor market without pre-vocational training. Among the NYC applicants we have had, I would say at least half would not be eligible for a job. They need all the supportive help you can give them. Work is the answer to an awful lot of things, but it has to be directed. This pre-vocational training is not only needed for the kids but by the adult population. We are an unskilled city". But, another participant responded, "you can't withhold jobs from kids for whom you have no other outlet by saying, "look, there are jobs around but we want to keep you here to counsel you. Come back next week and we'll talk to you again'. You can't do it. You have to accomodate them, if you can".

One participant suggested that, "we have 80% who could qualify for the [entry-level] jobs you speak of, but we have 90% of the employers who will not employ this 80% of the kids". Others were inclined to agree, but a few reported that, "employers are willing to do job training at their own expense, if we'll do the pre-vocational training. They cannot get people to come to work every day, to get along with their neighbors, to stay sober".

In the end, some participants believed that the schools must be encouraged to initiate effective vocational guidance and training programs during the early years of high school. This view was expressed by one participant who felt that, "we have a great opportunity in this [Primary and Secondary School] Education Act to really propose programs which emphasize vocational guidance. It's a simple thing to identify kids through threshold examinations even during the first year of high school who are likely to benefit most from vocational rather than academic programs — and then work with them specifically and openly in some form of vocational training".